DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 408 SO 030 045

AUTHOR Weiss, Alan Z.
TITLE A Survey of Teacher Attitudes of the German Democratic Republic to War and Peace and Their Perceptions and Misperceptions of Canadian Students.
INSTITUTION John Abbott Coll., Sainte Anne de Bellevue (Quebec).
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 54p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Capitalism; Educational Research; Foreign Countries; Foreign Policy; Higher Education; Marxism; Peace; *Political Attitudes; *Political Socialization; *Stereotypes; *Teacher Attitudes; War
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; *East Germany

ABSTRACT

Forty teachers attending a summer institute in East Germany in August of 1987 were given a questionnaire concerning their attitudes towards the German Democratic Republic and their opinions, perceptions, and misperceptions of Canadian students. The questionnaire was applied in Zwickau, East Germany at a small pedagogical college. Teachers were asked to respond twice: the first time as they would imagine a typical 17-to-18-year-old Canadian student would respond, and, second, according to their own opinions. In a written response section they were asked to give their opinions on two items: (1) personal and/or state violence, and (2) facts and/or opinions held on Canada and Canadian students. Findings showed that the teachers have a positive evaluation of themselves with regard to their attitudes toward war and peace, and they strongly agree that the Soviet Union has more positive proposals for peace than does the West. The teachers also hold positive ideas about Canada and the study showed that peace research can be useful in breaking down stereotypes. However, they also believe Canadian students are more imbued with Cold War ideology, support government policy, and oppose the demands and ideas of the Canadian peace movement. Sixty percent also believe Canadian students seldom or never talk about peace. Selected questionnaires and results from the questionnaire are appended. (NL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED355408

A SURVEY OF TEACHER ATTITUDES OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC TO WAR AND PEACE AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS AND MISPERCEPTIONS OF CANADIAN STUDENTS

DR. ALAN Z. WEISS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CEGEP
JOHN ABBOTT
COLLEGE
P.O. BOX / C.P. 2000
STE. ANNE DE BELLEVUE, QUEBEC, H9X 3L9

Dépôt Légal - 1er trimestre 1990

Bibliothèque Nationale du Québec

© Copyright John Abbott College

ABSTRACT OF

FINAL RESEARCH REPORT

JOHN ABBOTT COLLEGE

Title: A Survey of Teacher Attitudes of the German Democratic Republic to War and Peace and Their Perceptions and Misperceptions of Canadian Students

Project Co-ordinator: Alan Weiss, Humanities Department

Funding Source: Research & Development, John Abbott College

Date completed: May, 1988

Medium: Print [X]; Audio-visual [ ]; Computer Software [ ]; Other: _____ [ ]

Language: English [X]; French [ ]; Other: [ ] _____

Length of item: 48 pages

Major subject area covered: sociology

Abstract: The paper analyzes GDR teacher responses to Alan Silverman's questionnaire on Attitudes toward War and Peace, both according to their own opinions and their perceptions and misperceptions of Canadian (John Abbott) students. GDR teacher written and oral responses are also presented.

In oral discussions one of the most interesting discussion points centered around the question whether the reduction of Soviet strategic missiles by one-half unilaterally would be a step on the road to peace or would make the United States more aggressive. On GDR teacher perceptions of Canadian students, GDR teachers admitted they had a rather negative view of the Canadian "other," and wondered whether it was not their educational system which was to blame for this kind of "enemy imaging."

Availability: In library [X]; Refer to Project Co-ordinator [ ]

Reference #

RD11/86

A Survey of Teacher Attitudes of the German Democratic Republic to War and Peace and Their Perceptions and Misperceptions of Canadian Students

Dr. Alan Z. Weiss
Humanities Department
John Abbott College
Ste. Anne de Bellevue,
Quebec Canada H9X 3L9
April, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface and Acknowledgements	1
Introduction	2
Methodology	3
Actual GDR Teacher Opinions	5
Some More Interesting and Complex Responses by GDR Teachers	11
GDR Perceptions of Canadian Students	18
Conclusion	30
Appendix A	34
Footnotes	47

Preface and Acknowledgements

This research project started with Alan Silverman's administration of the questionnaire he worked out in his Peace Studies seminar to over 1000 John Abbott College students in Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec in the Spring term, 1987. Alan Silverman used Humanities classes, mine included, to administer this questionnaire, and I was very enthusiastic about the idea of how he was able to transform a seminar into a "project" that could have tangible academic results as far as information and understanding are concerned.

I asked Alan Silverman whether I could administer his questionnaire in the German Democratic Republic and he agreed to the idea. My first thanks, then, go to Alan Silverman for allowing me to use his questionnaire in the GDR. Thanks also go to Denise Bourgeois and Margaret Waller of FPDC for the help they gave me in setting up this research project, and to Ruth Harpe, Humanities Secretary, for helping me with the editing.

I would also like to thank Mrs. Eadoin Elliot of MIS for preparing the data for me, and Rick Stojack of the Psychology Department and Chris Balbanadur of the Math Department for helping me analyze the data.

Most of all, I would like to thank Lana de Liamchin of Research and Development. Without Lana's helpful hints and careful prodding this and other projects would not have come to fruition.

In the GDR I would especially like to thank Irmgard Theurer of the Liga fuer Volkerfreundschaft and Dr. Joachim

Seifert, Director of the Professional Development Summer Course for GDR junior and senior high school English teachers, for giving me permission to administer this questionnaire in the GDR and generally speaking giving their support to this research project.

Introduction

The questionnaire was administered in Zwickau, a small city with a population of 135,000 in the south central part of the GDR near the Czechoslovakian border in the district of Karl Marx Stadt. Historically it is famous as the birth place of Robert Schumann. Today the home where Schumann was born has been converted into the Robert Schumann Museum, which also features a recital hall where the International Robert Schumann Competition takes place. After Schumann left Zwickau, coal mines were discovered in the region. After World War II when there was no coal left, the production of automobiles became the major industry of the town and the Mining College was converted into the Ernst Schneller Pedagogical College. Like John Abbott College, the Ernst Schneller Pedagogical College is a self-contained campus located in a suburban residential neighborhood. It is there that the annual Professional Development Summer Course for junior and senior high school English teachers is held every August and where I have spent my last four summers.

I know that it is customary when speaking about Eastern

Europe to paint it in very serious and somber colours. That is because very few people in the West have any idea of the joy and human satisfaction many people in Eastern Europe derive from the existence of collectives at the work place. But the fact is, for me, these three weeks in Zwickau are some of the most enjoyable moments in the whole year. Tutoring a group of six-to-eight teachers, in addition to the time we spend in the classroom, we also have all our meals together, in the evening we get together for singing and socializing, and we usually go out to a restaurant in town once during the course. In addition, over the years those sides of my personality that otherwise would lie dormant have been put to good use in Zwickau. I play Schumann piano music to open and close the course and North American folk music at the morning sing-songs, as well as organize a square dancing club, drama club, and North American football club. After the course is over letters are sent to me from teachers about how they set up square dancing or folk music groups at the schools where they work. Every tutor gives a public lecture once during the course. By speaking about developments in teaching English as a second language in the Province of Quebec and about some of the interesting presentations at the latest SPEAQ-TESL Conference, some public relations work for Canada is accomplished. It is in this environment where my research was done.

Methodology

Before administering the survey in the GDR, predictions were made on how GDR teachers would respond to the questionnaire, based on my own biases, perceptions, and misperceptions. In August, 1987 teachers attending the Zwickau Summer Course were asked to respond to Alan Silverman's questionnaire twice. The first time GDR teachers were asked to imagine themselves as typical seventeen-to-eighteen year old Canadian student and to respond as they would believe their imaginary student would respond. The second time they were asked to respond according to their own opinion. GDR teachers were asked to answer the questionnaire in this order because it would have been in poor taste to ask GDR teachers straight out such questions as whether they could be financially enticed to work for the Pentagon. In a written response section they were also given the opportunity to express their opinion in writing on two items: 1) personal and/or state violence and 2) to state up to ten facts and/or opinions they have about Canada. The purpose of the second question about Canada was particularly to find out what kinds of biases they may have. The teachers had one week to respond to the questionnaire. My tutorial group then collated the responses, the results were typed out on ditto sheets, and passed back to the teachers. After this, two discussion circles were organized, one for a group of teachers who were interested in discussing the results, and the other for my tutorial group. These discussions were taped.

Upon returning to John Abbott College the results of the

study were put through the computer at MIS and a CATS-type analysis was made of it.

Before starting this paper, it should be made clear that even though throughout the paper it refers to "GDR teachers," it is really referring to the forty teachers who happened to be at the Zwickau summer course in August, 1987 and were willing to fill out the questionnaire. Obviously no sampling techniques were used, so that the results cannot accurately reflect the attitudes of all GDR teachers, let alone all GDR citizens. Nevertheless, even as a reflection of forty random teachers, the results raise many interesting questions, which will be dealt with in this paper.

Actual GDR Teacher Opinions

On most questions GDR school teachers have a positive evaluation of themselves in regard to attitudes toward war and peace. These straightforward responses will be summarized quickly, and then those questions which elicited more interesting and complicated responses will be discussed. **(See the actual questionnaire and the percentage results in Appendix A.)**

GDR teachers believe they are knowledgeable about American and Soviet disarmament proposals, the political situation between the United States and Nicaragua, on the one hand, the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, on the other, NATO, the cruise missile, and SDI. All of these issues are discussed

frequently in the GDR news media and in political discussions in schools. As school teachers, they are expected to keep up on political developments domestically and internationally and to be able to discuss them with students. In addition, with the exception of those people in Dresden without cable TV, practically all GDR citizens have access to the television of the Federal Republic of Germany and/or West Berlin, so they are well informed of Western viewpoints.

As far as attitudes and opinions are concerned, the vast majority of GDR teachers realistically assess that no country plans to invade Canada. They largely accept the state position of the GDR that it is the United States that is responsible for the arms race and the Soviet Union that has promulgated the most positive disarmament proposals. They are against SDI, Canada testing the cruise missile, and Canada selling weapons to the United States and the Third World. They do not think that spending money on arms creates jobs and that overall deterrence can be maintained by constantly increasing the arms race. On the other side, they do believe that the best way to preserve the peace is by eliminating nuclear weapons altogether. They do not believe that wars are a result of human nature, but that nuclear war can be prevented and that there are personal things they can do to prevent war. They think that peace movements are important and effective, and that the question of war should not be left to experts. On a personal level they feel they are non-violent, they have no contempt toward any racial or ethnic group or the

opposite sex, and that they would not be tempted by money to work for the Pentagon.

In the written response section, teachers were given an opportunity to state their opinions on personal and/or state violence. Here are some of their responses:

> In my opinion family and government institutions (e. g., Kindergartens, schools) play the most important role in promoting the harmonious development of a child. This includes the love of the parents, the feeling of being wanted and needed, the chance to be educated and to get an apprenticeship or a study place at university. Later it is important under what conditions a person has to live and work. If the individual has a job which gives him satisfaction, enough money, good relations to his work mates, a well-equipped flat, children, a wide range of possibilities to spend one's spare time (culture, sports, holiday facilities, etc.), there will be no need for violence. And if all people enjoy life and feel contentment, then I think it is possible for people to live with others in mutual understanding, peace, and without the need to resort to violence.
>
> The reason for violent behaviour lies in the capitalist system. People who are unemployed, but who want to have more money, turn to crime or murder. I think the people must be given work and money to live on. Then there would be no need for violent behaviour. Also, crime could be reduced by eliminating violent films and TV programmes, which show people how to commit crimes.
>
> Mutual understanding and confidence in each other should be strengthened (whether between people or countries,) then arms become more or less superfluous and violence is reduced.
>
> Autonomy of all ethnic groups of a country and equal rights in all respects will reduce violence.
>
> To reduce violence under socialist conditions, parents should give more love and less money to their children.

> A country is justified in resorting to physical violence when it does this to defend itself from other powers, e. g., the Vietnamese people in relation to U. S. soldiers in the Vietnam War or Nicaragua or Mozambique in relation to external aggressive forces.
>
> When a group of people, e. g. Black Americans, is attacked by a group of some other people who are violent, and no other means such as verbal persuasion can protect their security or life, then it is justified to use physical violence.
>
> A revolution is only valid when it is able to defend itself.

GDR teachers were also asked to state in writing up to ten facts and/or opinions they have about Canada. Here is a sample:

> If I hear the word Canada, I first of all think of hard winters, snow-covered areas, lonely farms, hard-working conditions, hockey, and a self-assured people with a realistic attitude to the most important problems of our time--but sometimes acting a bit violently and lacking in self-control.
>
> In Canada there is a great influence on the economy and policy by the USA.
>
> Canada fights against US domination of its economy and foreign policy.
>
> In Canada there are economic problems such as homelessness, poverty, unemployment, etc.
>
> In Canada the people have a high standard of living.
>
> In Canada the Indians, Inuit, and French Canadians face discrimination.
>
> Canadians manage better to co-exist with the native American inhabitants (Indians) than in the USA.
>
> Canada is a member of NATO.
>
> The Canadian government supports the Soviet

proposals to freeze the number of nuclear weapons overall in order to bring more security into the world.

Canada has never started a war. It doesn't have an aggressive foreign policy.

In Canada the peace movement is growing.

Canada has been in the past and is today the aim of many foreign peoples to settle in.

In Canada there is more tolerance than in many a country.

Ben Johnson is one of the best runners at 100 meters in the world.

Even in the times of the US embargo, Canada exported wheat to the USSR.

For contrast and comparison, here are some John Abbott student comments on the German Democratic Republic, in response to the question, "state up to ten facts and/or opinions you have about the German Democratic Republic (East Germany)":

All military alliances should be disbanded for they serve no purpose but exaggerate paranoid hysteria.

--communist; --people have no rights; --lots of unemployment; --women are inferior; --low education

Just because East Germany is behind the Iron Curtain doesn't mean its people are any different from us.

I don't know very much about East Germany. I know that West Germany lies behind the Iron Curtain.

I think both "Superpowers" should stop spending money on weapons and start spending it on poverty, pollution, health care and education.

--it takes years to get a car; --the roads are bad because of military traffic.

The lives and standard of living in East Germany are not as bad as the west claims it is.

They are not a democracy (German Democratic Republic). They are a communist state. They actively support and engage in the destabalization of Canada.

People are the same as they are here. The parents want their children to grow up and do well in school and succeed in life. They believe in their system, for it works for them as our system works for us.

The East German people want to bring down the wall. East German women are regarded as unattractive.

I'm sure that East German people are people just as we are. They are not all terrible people and I don't resent them.

I don't know much about East Germany. All I know is that the American forces, which are stationed there, prance around as if they own the place. Apart from that, they're probably just like us.

--communists; --narrow-minded; --stubborn;--scared; --ignorant

If we bring more arms into the picture, there will be more fear, and when people are afraid of each other (or countries), how can there be world peace? Just dump all the arms into space and let them float!

The East Germans are prisoners of a government they cannot vote out of power.

I don't think East Germans know very much about Canada. I think they should be informed about our involvement in the world's efforts for peace. Do they even know that Canada exists? On East Germany: It is a communist country.

East Germany is helping in the plot to overthrow entire free world.

I see them like us, mostly. They probably don't have the same mentality, but they probably do the same things we do.

The one major difference is that the East Germans feel that men are superior to women. Women should not be allowed to join in military combat, whereas our country has been changing its rules and allowing women to train for combat now.

East German citizens desire peace in a nuclear-free Europe.

--lack of choice; --lack of essentials; --kept poor by government; --no elections; --no fashion; --no freedom of speech; --no choice of jobs

Cultural exchanges with the west are helping relations.

East Germans aren't very well informed on world affairs. There are a lot of military people all over the country.

East Germans live in a totally demilitarized, weapon-free zone.

Some More Interesting and Complex Responses by GDR Teachers

Returning to the questionnaire, there are some topics in it which elicited a more interesting and complex response by GDR teachers. One of them was women. Although the vast majority of foreign language secondary school teachers in the GDR are women, nevertheless, GDR school teachers are much less affected by the feminist agenda than Canadian students. Many female teachers believe they have already gained equal rights with men under "socialist conditions," and many of them accept or at least are influenced by a Marxist approach, which places greater emphasis on "class" than "sex" oppression. Hence, the majority of GDR respondents disagree with question #49, that the main reason for war is that men are generally speaking in leadership positions.

Also, unlike Canadian students, 40% of GDR teachers do not believe women should be allowed in combat roles in the military, while 20% support it. In the oral discussion of the results GDR teachers explained that they interpreted question #52 on women in combat differently from Canadian students. GDR teachers responded more to the expansion of the military as implied in giving women combat roles and in their general revulsion at this possibility. As one female teacher put it, in the GDR there has been so much anti-militarist propaganda that the GDR has had great difficulty recruiting boys to enter officer school. In such a climate it would be impossible to recruit large numbers of women into the army. It was then my job to explain to GDR teachers that JAC student attitudes are not more "militarist" than GDR teachers, but that they saw the abstract question of allowing women into combat roles as a part of the general emancipation of women in society and the notion that women are capable of doing everything a man can do.

For me one of the unexpected results was to question #47, whether "war is learned behaviour, and, as such, can be unlearned." A prediction was made that GDR teachers would strongly agree with the notion that war is learned, because of my assumption that GDR teachers would believe that militarist and pacifist attitudes are influenced by education. In fact, of the forty respondents, only four agreed with the notion that war is learned and 26 disagreed. In discussion of these results one GDR teacher gave the example of World War II to explain the GDR

teachers' answer on this question. This war was not dependent on individual attitudes, but resulted from problems between countries; the decision to go to war was made by politicians, not by civilians. It is true that societies can encourage militarist or anti-militarist attitudes, but the ultimate decision to go to war is made by governments, not individuals. Soldiers in combat are, then, seen as victims of state policy rather than as representatives of the will of the nation.

GDR teacher responses were also interesting in relationship to specific questions relating to Canada. Although, as noted above, GDR teachers are opposed to Canada testing the cruise missile and selling weapons to the U. S. and the Third World, on other Canadian military-related questions, they took a much less polemical stance. On question #36, on Canadian defense spending, a prediction was made, based on the ideological assumption that GDR teachers would believe that capitalist countries are "militarist and aggressive by nature," that they would say that Canada spends too much on the military. In fact only sixteen responded in that way, while 23 responded with "no opinion." Some discussants responded that their "no opinion" position is simply a reflection that they are largely uninformed about Canada, and so have no right to comment on a topic with which they're not well informed. GDR teachers also chose "no opinion" to question #40, on whether respondents were satisfied with the steps Canada had made to promote peace. Again, this was an honest appraisal of their ignorance rather than an

ideologically biased response. Similarly, only 23 of the 40 respondents said that Canada should withdraw from NATO, and on Canadian defense spending, only sixteen said it was too much, while 23 had "no opinion." All of these questions give some indication that GDR teachers are not blinded by ideological blinkers, but have an honest perception of their own limitations, contrary to my own prediction of their responses.

GDR teacher responses on nuclear power plants are obviously influenced by national conditions and perceptions. To question #32, seven respondents believed Canada should build nuclear power plants, eleven not build, sixteen were not sure, and five had no opinion. GDR state policy, despite Chernobyl, is not negative toward nuclear power. In comparison to other European countries the GDR has relatively few nuclear power plants (three vs. over 40 in the Federal Republic of Germany). But anti-nuclear sentiment is very small in the GDR in comparison to Western Europe, Canada, and even the Soviet Union. Perhaps this is so because the major source of domestic energy in the GDR is lignite, which is terribly polluting. In order to reduce expensive oil imports, the GDR tries to rely on its own domestic production. As a consequence, acid rain is very bad in the GDR and forest deterioration in particularly hard-hit areas has set in. Although many people in the GDR were scared by Chernobyl, given the fact that they don't have water power resources as we have in Canada, they don't see any alternative in the GDR to nuclear energy for the production of "clean" energy. Based on

the discussions we had on this problem, one can hypothesize that these attitudes toward their own national situation may have had some influence on their answers on nuclear power plants in Canada.

Perhaps the most interesting and provocative set of GDR responses has to do with GDR teacher perceptions of who is ahead in conventional and nuclear arms, and what would happen if the Soviet Union unilaterally reduced its strategic nuclear arms by 50%. On questions #26 and #27 on who is ahead in the conventional and nuclear arms race, a prediction was made in both cases that the majority of GDR teachers would say that the United States was ahead, based in part on my own understanding of the arms race.(1) Also, since the official GDR state position, which is supported by GDR teachers' responses, indicates they believe that the United States and NATO are responsible for the arms race and that the arms race is being driven by the military-industrial complexes of various advanced capitalist states, one could assume that GDR teachers would perceive that the United States was ahead in both conventional and nuclear arms. In fact, as far as conventional arms were concerned, my prediction was absolutely incorrect. Not one GDR teacher responded that the United States was superior to the Soviet Union in conventional arms. Rather eleven of the forty responded that the Soviet Union was ahead in conventional weapons, eighteen responded that both sides were equal, and ten responded that both sides were so strong it really didn't matter.

If one compares actual GDR teacher and JAC student responses, it is interesting to note that only 11.6% of JAC students responded that both sides were equal in conventional weapons and 42% responded that both sides were so strong, it really didn't matter. Even more strikingly, on nuclear weapons, while 55.5% of JAC students and only 32.5% of GDR teachers believe that both sides are so strong, it doesn't make any difference, 12% of JAC students and 47.5% of GDR teachers believe both sides are equal. One of the reasons for this difference between GDR teachers and JAC students may be that GDR teachers believe that the arms race is meaningful, i. e., that it is important for the Soviet Union to keep up with the United States in the arms race in order to keep the world at peace, whereas perhaps a plurality of JAC students (and myself included) believe that the arms race has reached such dizzying heights that an absolute balance is not necessary to maintain stability.

Even more interesting in this respect is the striking difference between GDR teachers on question #64, "If the Soviet Union unilaterally eliminated one-half of its strategic nuclear weapons, what would happen?" 42.5% of GDR teachers believe it would be a step on the road to peace, 50% believe it would make the United States more aggressive, and 5% believe it wouldn't make any difference as far as peace is concerned. My prediction also was that GDR teachers would respond that a Soviet reduction by one-half of strategic missiles would make the United States more aggressive, but the fact that nearly half of the GDR

teachers responded that it would be a step on the road to peace indicates great division on this question.

In the discussion of the results GDR teachers were just as divided on this question as they were in answering the questionnaire. With those who answered that the United States would become more aggressive, one could think, based on the notion that "capitalism is aggressive by nature," that the problem lie in ideological blinkers. But those who gave this response generally speaking stayed away from generalities and concentrated on specifics. A typical justification of a GDR teacher who answered that a Soviet reduction would make the U. S. more aggressive is the following:

> I want to say that in this connection the worst thing is the SDI programme, because Gorbachev made the proposal of unilaterally eliminating half of its strategic nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union, but the USA had to stop working on the SDI programme. And they (the Soviet Union) didn't agree to this. And I think this is the point. They (the USA) always want to have something behind.

In response to the above statement, another GDR teacher replied:

> I think a major change in attitudes toward negotiations took place in the last year or since Gorbachev became General Secretary. In the years before there were also made positive proposals, but then all this came to a stop, which is true today. In the past something like SDI always stood against it, and then it was finished. But now Gorbachev says, yes, we will do it, we will do it again and again, we will do one step after another. And by that politics it is impossible for the Americans, if they want to be believed by their own people and if they want to maintain their support, they must at some point in that way come to an agreement at a certain point. I don't feel endangered more by the politics of Gorbachev of going back and making more and more

> proposals, which seems to make our military position more weak than it was before.

Finally, another GDR teacher summed up the debate on this question, and the change toward "new thinking" as represented by the Gorbachev style of political negotiations with the following statement:

> I think the only thing to make peace safe for all - to safeguard peace among nations - will be that the understanding and confidence in each other will be greater. When we have on our side fifty atom bombs and the other side fifty atom bombs or we one atom bomb and you one atom bomb, this is a balance, OK, but it doesn't guarantee that peace will be maintained. But if we have confidence in each other - you don't attack me, I don't attack you - and then cooperation also in the economic field would be better, I think then also the minds of these people who have their fingers on the trigger will change a little bit, and say, OK, we won't press on the button. I think understanding and confidence will be the most important and decisive thing for maintaining peace.

Obviously, this question is not settled in the minds of GDR teachers, as it has not been settled in the minds of the peoples of the world. But hopefully the Gorbachev-Reagan summits of 1987 and 1988 will start to move the peoples on both sides of East and West away from distrust of each other towards a belief that arms reduction, even unilateral arms reduction, is a good thing, since the other side can be trusted; and a belief that unilateral disarmament or nuclear inferiority will not cause the other side to be more aggressive, but will serve as an act on the road to peace.

GDR Perceptions of Canadian Students

As in the previous section on GDR teacher attitudes, in this part, those perceptions where GDR teachers see Canadian students positively or realistically will be dealt with quickly, while more time will be spent on negative and complex perceptions.

GDR teachers predict Canadian student responses positively on such questions as whether "nuclear annihilation will be the fate of the human species within my lifetime." 52.5% of GDR teachers predict Canadian students will disagree with this statement, whereas only 43.7% of JAC students actually disagreed with it. Only 7.5% of GDR teachers imagine Canadian students will agree that nuclear annihilation will be their fate, whereas 15.1% of JAC students responded that way. Similarly, on the question of level of involvement, GDR teachers tended to believe that Canadian students are more involved in peace activities by attending meetings or reading articles than they actually are. GDR teachers also imagine Canadian students to be informed about NATO, the cruise missile, SDI, and to a lesser extent Soviet policy in Afghanistan.

GDR teachers are split on how informed Canadian students are on U. S. disarmament policy and U. S. policy toward Nicaragua. They believe Canadian students will describe themselves as uninformed on Soviet disarmament policy. In fact, overall on knowledge-type questions, GDR teachers rated Canadian students as more knowledgeable than JAC students rated themselves. In fact, the only two questions about which JAC

students felt themselves to be informed were on SDI and the cruise missile. On the other side, as far as GDR teachers are concerned, they see themselves overall as being better informed than their Canadian student counterparts.

On other questions besides those dealing with knowledge, GDR teachers have a more mixed perception of Canadian students. On the question of whether wars are inevitable because of human nature, GDR teacher predictions are divided across the spectrum of responses, which reflects fairly accurately JAC student attitudes. On the question of whether "there are things I can do that would help prevent a nuclear war," GDR teachers are split on Canadian student responses with 47.5% predicting "not sure," 25% that Canadian students would agree, and 27.5% that they would disagree. Again, this reflects fairly accurately JAC student responses. On "how much interest do you take in issues of war, peace and current events," GDR teachers again go for the middle ground with 60% predicting "some interest," 25% predicting "very little interest" and 10% predicting "a lot of interest," which again reflects quite accurately actual JAC student responses.

With the remaining questions dealt with in this paper, GDR teachers tend to have a more negative, pessimistic perception of Canadian students. On the question of "why worry about whether there will be a nuclear war because there is not much I can do to prevent it anyway," 47.5% of GDR teachers predict Canadian students will agree with it and only 27.5% will disagree with it. In fact, 43.9% of JAC students actually disagreed with

the above statement, while 34.8% agreed. Generally speaking, JAC students are more optimistic about the prevention of nuclear war than GDR teachers imagine them to be. On the question, "the subject of nuclear weapons, war, and peace is too complex for people like me to think about; it should be left to the experts," GDR teachers again give a divided perception of their Canadian student counterparts with 42.5% predicting Canadian students would agree with the above statement and 37.5% predicting they would disagree. In fact, 54.9% of JAC students disagree with leaving questions of war and peace to experts and only 17.2% agree. Again, JAC students are much less passive and pessimistic than GDR teachers imagine they are.

Some of the more negative perceptions GDR teachers have of Canadian student attitudes are indicated in question #53, "how often do you talk with friends or parents about issues of war and peace" and question #65, whether Canadian students think the peace movement is effective or ineffective. 60% of GDR teachers predict Canadian students seldom or never talk about peace, while, in fact, 52.4% of Canadian students sometimes or frequently discuss peace and 45.8% seldom or never discuss peace. This negative perception may be influenced by West German television, which, like North American television, gives the impression that young people are only interested in their own personal advancement, and are totally apolitical as far as the world scene is concerned. On peace movements, 30% of GDR teachers predict Canadian students will say peace movements are

effective, while the remaining 70% predict ineffective or unnecessary. In fact, this prediction was fairly accurate, since only 34.4% of Canadian students believe peace movements are necessary and effective. Nevertheless, it reiterates the general tendency that the Canadian student is very different from the GDR teacher in a number of negative ways.

GDR teachers also tend to believe that Canadian students are much more imbued with Cold War ideology than they actually are, as indicated by the JAC data. On conventional weapons 70% of GDR teachers predict that Canadian students will say that the Soviet Union has the lead. In fact, only 24.2% of JAC students respond that the Soviet Union is ahead in conventional arms, while 42% answer that both sides are so strong, it really doesn't matter. On nuclear weapons, a plurality of 35% of GDR teachers imagine the majority of Canadian students will give the Soviet Union as the leading nuclear power, whereas only 10.1% of JAC students actually gave this answer. As Alan Silverman stated in his analysis of JAC student responses,

> Suffice it to say that most students do not agree with the official Canadian and American position that the USSR is far superior in conventional strength and "ahead" in nuclear weapons. . . Students appear to be more critical of the U. S. than the USSR (except for the possibility of Canada's security being threatened.) The U. S. was perceived as more responsible for the arms race than the USSR (14.2% vs. 4.4%); the USSR was seen as making more positive proposals and actions for peace than the U. S. (28.1% vs 12.8%) and in an answer to a question on unilateral disarmament initiatives the U. S. was seen as more likely to react aggressively to the other side's initiative than the USSR (16.5% vs. 12.5%).(2)

On invading Canada, although 75% of GDR teachers have what could be described as a realistic view that nobody threatens Canada with an invasion, while 37.5% of GDR teachers believe Canadian students think the same way they do, another 37.5% of GDR teachers predict that Canadian students believe the Soviet Union might invade Canada. In fact, only 17.4% of JAC students said the Soviet Union might invade Canada, while 39.8% said that no country threatened Canadian sovereignty. Moreover, even though 75% of GDR teachers believe the U. S. is responsible for the arms race, 60% of GDR teachers predict that Canadian students will blame both the United States and the Soviet Union. 15% of GDR teachers predict Canadian students will blame only the Soviet Union for the arms race. In fact, only 4.4% of JAC students blame only the S. U., 14.2% only the U. S., and 58.2% blame both the United States and the Soviet Union. On this question GDR teachers have a more realistic appraisal of Canadian students than in the other questions we have dealt with so far on American-Soviet relations.

GDR teachers were unanimous in their belief that the Soviet Union has the most positive proposals for peace. A prediction was made that GDR teachers would also say that Canadian students would ascribe the most positive peace proposals to the Soviet Union as well, again, based on the assumption that people in the GDR are taught that the capitalist state in the West does not maintain hegemonic ideological control of the population. My prediction was wrong. 40% of GDR teachers

imagine Canadian students will ascribe positive proposals to both the U. S. and the Soviet Union, 27.5% to the United States, and only 20% to the Soviet Union. Interestingly, on this question the largest plurality (28.1%) of JAC students ascribed the most positive peace proposals to the Soviet Union, obviously suggesting that Gorbachev's message is starting to get through, at least to JAC students.

On question #63, on what would happen if the U. S. reduced its strategic nuclear weapons by one-half, a prediction was made that GDR teachers would say that Canadian students would see this as a step on the road to peace. In fact, while 35% of GDR teachers believe Canadian students would see American unilateral disarmament as a step on the road to peace, 42.5% of GDR teachers predicted Canadian students would say that U. S. unilateral disarmament would make the Soviet Union more aggressive. In fact, a 48.6% plurality of JAC students believed that a halving of American strategic missiles would be a step toward peace, while only 12.5% believed that such an act would make the Soviet Union more aggressive.

In all of the above questions it is clear that GDR teachers imagine Canadian students as imbued with the "enemy image" to a much greater extent than they actually are. As Alan Silverman stated,

> On some issues, such as testing the Cruise Missile, "Star Wars," the building and selling of nuclear reactors, the responsibility for the arms race, and superpower proposals and actions for peace, the students are in opposition to the line of the Canadian government and generally

correspond to the demands and ideas of the Canadian peace movement.(3)

On the whole, GDR teachers imagine the contrary, that Canadian students will support the line of the Canadian government and oppose the demands and ideas of the Canadian peace movement. These results are personally very interesting for me, especially because on the whole they were not expected, since in the GDR people are, generally speaking, taught that the capitalist system does not maintain ideological hegemony over the population, that the peace movement is constantly growing in capitalist states, and that the population is standing up to the deceptions the society is trying to foist on them. On the one side, although it is satisfying to realize that GDR teachers can think independently and do not reduce reality to ideological shibboleths, on the other side, it is disturbing that this independence is made at the expense of realizing that the Canadian "other" may share many of the same opinions and concerns as the GDR teacher, and may be an ally in the struggle for peace.

The most surprising response in this respect was question #67, on whether the arms industry creates jobs. While GDR teachers overwhelmingly believe, as far as the GDR is concerned, that the arms industry creates fewer jobs than if the capital were invested elsewhere, 55% of GDR teachers predict that a majority of Canadian students will respond that the arms industry creates jobs. This was most surprising, since one of the GDR cardinal principles is that military spending in all conditions and situations has harmful macroeconomic effects on capitalist

economies.(4) One would then surmise that GDR people would be convinced that most people in capitalist countries must think that military spending is a bad thing and a kind of "conspiracy" imposed upon an unwilling populace by the military-industrial complex. To me it is no surprise that a plurality (36.4%) of JAC students said military spending is bad for the economy. On the whole, the rationale of economic gain through military spending is seldom used in the West.(5) It would be a rather crass and unsympathetic justification for military spending to say it was being done to improve economic performance. Rather, military spending is presented as something that has to be done out of necessity in order to maintain national security. Again, GDR teachers tend to see what they perceive as the hegemonic militaristic ideology in capitalist countries to be believed and accepted by Canadian students.

The results were also interesting on question #45, "the best way to prevent another world war is for our side to build up such strong defense that the other side will be deterred (stopped) from attacking us." Of all questions there was the greatest amount of agreement between Canadian students and GDR teachers on this one--both sides don't believe in it. As Alan Silverman pointed out in his analysis of this response, Canadian student disagreement with deterrence goes against official Canadian state policy, as stated by the Canadian Department of National Defense in their information brochure, "Peace and Security," which is quoted below:

> Since 1945, nuclear weapons have transformed the nature of war and peace. Wars that might involve their use must be prevented, rather than 'won.' But there are no easy or ideal solutions to this problem. For example, the one-sided abandonment by the free world of nuclear weapons (unilateral disarmament) would not enhance peace or preserve our way of life. On the contrary, it would encourage others to take advantage of our weakness.
>
> If war is to be prevented, Canada and its allies must maintain adequate military forces, both conventional and nuclear, and make clear to potential aggressors that we are prepared to use them in defence. In short, Canada must contribute to the system of deterrence which has successfully protected us for almost forty years and allowed us to live in peace and freedom.(6)

While 72.5% of GDR teachers disagree with deterrence as a way of maintaining the peace over the long haul, 72.3% of JAC students also disagree with deterrence. Nevertheless, 77.5% of GDR teachers predict Canadian students will agree with deterrence. Again, GDR teachers see Canadian students . as much more "militaristic" than themselves and in comparison to how Canadian students actually see themselves.

However, not only in relationship to abstract attitudes toward war and peace, but also in relationship to personal attitudes toward violence, racism and sexism do GDR teachers believe that Canadian students will see themselves much more negatively than GDR teachers see themselves. On question #46, how one would respond to violence in sport by the opposing side, while 47.5% of GDR teachers would respond by attempting verbal persuasion, GDR teachers predict 42.5% of Canadian students would respond by tripping and 35% by threatening the other side. In

this case, GDR teacher predictions were fairly accurate, since the largest plurality of JAC students (28.9%) said they would trip their opponent. Similarly, while only 5% of GDR teachers believe that when their interests conflict with others, they would try to win the conflict, 52.5% of GDR teachers predict Canadian students would try to win the conflict. On this question only 26.8% of JAC students said they would try to win the conflict. Nevertheless, the fact that Canadian students would choose the violent option was commented on by GDR teachers in our oral discussion of the results, some of whom decried this tendency in the West, others felt that this was a general characteristic of young people both in the GDR and Canada. In Alan Silverman's research he noted that more males than females chose the violent option, and the fact that most foreign language teachers in the GDR are female may account for part of the difference. Even so, irrespective of how Canadian students actually are or believe they are, GDR teachers do imagine their Canadian student counterparts as being very different and having more negative character traits than they have.

In the case of violence GDR teachers made accurate predictions. In question #56, dealing with "whether there are groups of people (cultural, ethnic, sexual, racial, etc.) for whom you feel some contempt or disrespect," the results are less ambiguous. While 67.5% of GDR teachers responded "no" and 10% "yes" to this question in terms of their own attitudes, 42.5% of GDR teachers predicted Canadian students would answer "yes" and

22.5% "no." In fact, only 34.7% of JAC students answered "yes," they did feel contempt towards a group of people, and 50.3% answered "no." While discussing the results on Canadian student responses to questions relating to the military, one of the GDR teachers related the misperceptions the GDR teachers had in this area with the misperceptions they had on Canadian student attitudes toward discrimination. The following comments were made:

> It's quite the same result in question #56. "Are there any groups of people you feel some contempt or disrespect." It's the same problem, I think, and the same result.
>
> Alan Weiss: Yes, you thought that the majority of Canadian students would say they feel contempt or disrespect for other people, when in fact they're the same as you. The majority said, no, they don't feel contempt or disrespect for other people. In that way they're similar to you.
>
> I think it's a kind of stereotype, which we have got for both the U. S. Americans and Canadians, which are mixed up in our minds. And this stereotype says that the normal U. S. or the average U. S. citizen is for military development and that the ordinary U. S. American takes part in the discrimination against minorities. And because we don't know enough about the differences between these two states (Canada and the USA), I mean, it's the reason.

Another teacher added:

> Speaking of stereotypes, I believe we can go a step further. This is not only a stereotype between us and the USA and Canada, but I would like to say it's a stereotype between socialist and capitalist countries. And who is for that, I believe, we can only find out in our education, in our system, and as a whole. We - I think we make sometimes this mistake to see all in black or white - it's a German expression - and we need more differences between black and white--shadows. And that we're on the right way, I

> think shows the international development as a whole.

These comments were very satisfying because they indicated how this kind of peace research can be very useful in breaking down stereotypes and helpful in the building up of mutual trust and understanding. Every effort that can be made to show that the "other"--be that person American, Soviet, Canadian or East German--is not a dehumanized evil monster, but is a sensitive human being with positive impulses toward peace, understanding, and human comradery, then one small step has been taken towards improving relations between East and West and breaking down some of the stereotypes that divide us.

Conclusion

Petra Hesse in her article, "Stereotypes Mask Feelings of Fear" states:

> Psychoanalysts have suggested that we tend to deny our own antisocial and aggressive impulses and project them onto an enemy outside of ourselves or our own national group. . . By portraying enemies as . . inhuman or immoral, [we] decrease identification with them as other human beings, and thus lower the threshold for aggression against them.(7)

In this article Petra Hesse presents overwhelming evidence of the efforts of the mass media in the West to dehumanize the Soviet Union and to reduce the world into "us" (good) vs. "them" (evil), an easily comprehensible stereotype. As former President Richard Nixon said in his book The Real War,

> It may seem melodramatic to treat the twin poles of human experience represented by the United States and the Soviet Union as the equivalent of Good and Evil, Light and Darkness, God and the Devil: yet if we allow ourselves to think of them that way, even hypothetically, it can help clarify our perspective on the world struggle.(8)

To put Nixon's remarks into some perspective, I would like to quote Herman Goering:

> The people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are threatened with attack, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger.(9)

And Adolf Hitler wrote in Mein Kampf:

> In general the art of all truly great leaders at all times consists among other things primarily in not dividing the attention of a people, but in concentrating it upon a single foe.(10)

All of this is not to disparage the GDR teachers whom I have worked with and become close to. In their written responses on Canada (and particularly in comparison to JAC student written responses about the GDR) one can see that on the whole GDR teachers emphasized positive things about Canada and did not tend to concentrate on our negative features like our homelessness or unemployment. As far as GDR teachers' own attitudes toward war and peace, these are attitudes that on the whole the Canadian peace movement and the Canadian people can certainly live with. But as far as their perception of the abstract "other," the Canadian student, it tends to be a rather negative one, as GDR teachers readily acknowledge themselves. As reported in John Mack's essay, "What about the Russians?" twelve year-old Karen Zacarias stated,

> I feel sorry for the Russians. We both have nuclear bombs, but we are the only country in the whole wide world who's actually dropped one and killed all of those people. We are scared of Russia, but they must be super-scared of us.(11)

In the GDR this kind of fear of the West, as indicated by the data, seems to be very much alive.

But even more than the fear that the East has of the West and vice versa, the mutual fear of nuclear annihilation can serve to unite East and West in trying to prevent such an occurrence from ever happening. In former President Jimmy Carter's Farewell Address of January 15, 1981, he stated:

> It has now been 35 years since the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima. The great majority of the world's people cannot remember a time when the nuclear shadow did not hang over the earth. Our minds have adjusted to it as after a time our eyes adjust to the dark. Yet the risk of a nuclear conflagration has not lessened. It has not happened yet, but that can give us little comfort--for it only has to happen once.
>
> The danger is becoming greater as the arsenals of the superpowers grow in size and sophistication, and as other governments acquire these weapons, it may only be a matter of time before madness, desperation, greed, or miscalculation let loose this terrible force.(12)

Since the summer of 1987 when this survey was taken, the Washington Summit of December, 1987 and Moscow Summit of May, 1988 have and are in the process of making tremendous strides forward away from "enemy imaging." The most hopeful note to my mind in this survey is the deep division GDR teachers have on the question, "what would happen, if the Soviet Union unilaterally eliminated one-half of its strategic weapons, would it make the

United States more aggressive or would it be a step on the road to peace?" As one GDR teacher explained to me, if this survey had been conducted five years earlier, it would have been absolutely clear that the overwhelming percentage of GDR teachers would have answered, "it would make the United States more aggressive." Hopefully, in the coming years, as relations improve between the nation states of the world and regional conflicts are eliminated, more and more people in both East and West will see nuclear disarmament as a good thing, which does not in any way endanger national security. As John Mack stated:

> The recognition that there can be no meaningful survival on this planet in a full-scale nuclear exchange must lead to a shift of consciousness with regard to the "enemy" which permits us to imagine more empathically how the nuclear threat appears from the perspective of the leadership and people in a potential adversary nation.
>
> What this comes to ultimately is a global sense of responsibility on the part of citizens and leaders, a shift from the "we or they" mentality to a "we and they" consciousness. Such a shift in consciousness will take place only when fear and suspicion are reduced to the point that the human capacity for caring can be directed toward all peoples.(13)

Or as a teenager at Arlington High School in Massachusetts stated:

> Enemies don't talk. They either avoid the other or they fight, or yell, or take 'low blows' at each other. Friends whisper and laugh. All I propose is that the two superpowers talk. DIALOGUE is the very first step towards anywhere. To step toward a mutually safe place, we need GOOD dialogue, not sporadic visits between busy heads of state, congressmen, or lawyers and other professionals who have been appointed 'experts.' I propose a restructuring and empowerment of full-time diplomacy.(14)

Appendix A

Selected Question and Results

Code: Results are given in percent, based on 1,073 JAC student responses and 40 GDR teacher responses. * is my (Alan Weiss') predictions of GDR teacher responses.

Quest. #

United States vs. the Soviet Union

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
15. How would you evaluate your level of information about American disarmament policies?			
A. I am well-informed	10.0	8.1	7.5
B. I am informed	72.5	33.2	40.0
C. I have heard of it but am not sure what it's all about	7.5	37.9	32.5
D. I do not know what it is	10.0*	20.2	20.0*
16. How would you evaluate your level of information about Soviet disarmament policies?			
A. I am well-informed	75.0*	6.4	0
B. I am informed	25.0	28.8	32.5*
C. I have heard of it but am not sure what it's all about	0	37.3	47.5
D. I do not know what it is	0	26.5	20.0
18. How would you evaluate your level of information about U. S. policy with regard to Nicaragua?			
A. I am well-informed	25.0*	14.5	5.0
B. I am informed	75.0	29.4	42.5*
C. I have heard of it but am not sure what it's all about	0	36.6	42.5

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
D. I do not know what it is	0	18.6	10.0

19. How would you evaluate your level of information about Soviet policy with regard to Afghanistan?

A. I am well-informed	17.5	8.5	12.5
B. I am informed	77.5*	25.7	45.0*
C. I have heard of it but am not	5.0	34.9	35.0
D. I do not know what it is	0	30.2	5.0

26. When you compare the conventional military strength of the superpowers, would you say that:

A. the Soviet Union is superior	27.5	24.2	70.0
B. the United States is superior	0*	12.6	10.0
C. both sides are equal	45.0	11.6	7.5*
D. both sides are so strong, it doesn't matter who is ahead	25.0	42.0	5.0
E. don't know	2.5	8.6	7.5

27. When you compare the strength of the nuclear weapons of the superpowers, would you say that:

A. the Soviet Union is superior	0	10.1	35.0
B. the United States is superior	17.5*	15.4	17.5*
C. both sides are equal	47.5	12.0	22.5
D. both sides are so strong, it	32.5	55.5	20.0
E. don't know	2.5	6.2	0

37. Are there any countries that would possibly invade Canada or threaten our security?

A. Yes, the Soviet Union	0	17.4	37.5
B. Yes, the United States	17.5	8.3	2.5

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
C. Yes, the United States and the Soviet Union	0	22.5	20.0
D. Yes, some other country	0	7.4	0
E. No	75.0*	39.8	37.5*

38. Who is principally responsible for the arms race and the threat of nuclear war?

A. the Soviet Union	0	4.4	15.0
B. the United States	75.0*	14.2	2.5
C. the United States and the Soviet Union	7.5	58.2	60.0
D. another country	0	2.1	0
E. many countries	12.5	19.2	15.0*

39. Which of the following have made the most positive proposals and actions for peace?

A. the Soviet Union	100.0*	28.1	20.0*
B. the United States	0	12.8	27.5
C. the United States and the Soviet Union	0	9.9	40.0
D. another country or countries	0	19.1	7.5
E. none of the above	0	23.7	5.0

63. "If the United States unilaterally (that is, doing it alone) eliminated one half of its strategic (big and long-range) nuclear weapons, then the following would happen:"

A. this would be a step on the road to peace	95.0*	48.6	35.0*
B. this would encourage the Soviets to be more aggressive	0	12.5	42.5

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
C. it would make no difference as far as peace is concerned	5.0	17.2	12.5
D. no opinion	0	14.2	10.0

64. "If the Soviet Union unilaterally (that is, doing it alone) eliminated one half of its strategic (big and long-range) nuclear weapons, then the following would happen:"

A. this would be a step on the road to peace	42.5	44.2	67.5*
B. this would encourage the United States to be more aggressive	50.0*	16.5	7.5
C. it would make no difference as far as peace was concerned	5.0	17.4	12.5
D. no opinion	0	13.3	12.5

<u>The Peace Movement and Personal Sense of Engagement, Helplessness</u>

41. "Wars are inenvitable because of human nature."

A. strongly agree	2.5	11.5	2.5
B. agree	7.5	31.4	25.0
C. not sure	5.0	16.2	40.0
D. disagree	40.0	27.9	30.0*
E. strongly disagree	45.0*	11.7	2.5

50. How much interest do you take in issues of war, peace, and current events?

A. no interest at all	0	4.9	0
B. very little interest	0	16.2	25.0
C. some interest	5.0	49.8	60.0*
D. a lot of interest	80.0	19.5	10.0

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
E. a very great interest	15.0*	8.2	0
53. How often do you talk with friends or parents about issues of war and peace?			
A. never	0	12.4	5.0
B. seldom	0	33.4	55.0
C. sometimes	52.5*	41.6	35.0*
D. frequently	47.5	10.8	5.0
54. "Why worry about whether there will be a nuclear war because there is not much I can do to prevent it anyway."			
A. strongly agree	0	8.9	15.0
B. agree	5.0	25.9	32.5*
C. not sure	0	18.1	25.0
D. disagree	67.5	31.6	27.5
E. strongly disagree	27.5*	12.3	0
55. "Nuclear annihilation will probably be the fate of the human species within my lifetime."			
A. strongly agree	0	4.7	0
B. agree	0	7.5*	10.3
C. not sure	22.5	37.9	37.5
D. disagree	50.0	29.7	50.0
E. strongly disagree	25.0*	14.0	2.5
59. Which of the following most closely corresponds to your activities regarding peace, war, and related social issues?			
A. I am involved in a group	27.5	2.5	7.5

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
B. I attend a meeting or a demonstration from time to time	52.5*	5.6	37.5
C. I occasionally read an article	10.0	53.7	30.0
D. I am not interested at all	0	10.2	7.5
E. I think about them	7.5	21.7	10.0*
60. "There are things that I can do that <u>would</u> help prevent a nuclear war."			
A. strongly agree	20.0*	7.0	0
B. agree	65.0	24.1	25.0
C. not sure	12.5	39.1	47.5*
D. disagree	2.5	23.4	27.5
E. strongly disagree	0	1.6	0
62. "The subject of nuclear weapons, war and peace is too complex for people like me to think about; it should be left to the experts."			
A. strongly agree	0	2.4	12.5
B. agree	2.5	6.0	30.0
C. not sure	0	15.3	20.0*
D. disagree	70.0	41.2	35.0
E. strongly disagree	27.5*	30.0	2.5
65. Which of the following most closely reflects your attitude?			
A. peace movements are necessary and effective	82.5*	34.4	30.0
B. peace movements are necessary and ineffective	17.5	39.0	55.0*
C. peace movements are unnecessary	0	5.4	2.5

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
D. no opinion	0	13.1	12.5

Issues

9. How would you evaluate your level of information about the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)?

A. I am well-informed	10.0	8.1	12.5
B. I am informed	85.0*	37.7	72.5*
C. I have heard of it but am not sure what it's all about	5.0	45.8	15.0
D. I do not know what this is.	0	8.1	0

11. How would you evaluate your level of information about the cruise missile?

A. I am well-informed	20.0*	16.7	17.5
B. I am informed	77.5	51.7	50.0*
C. I have heard of it but am not sure what it's all about	2.5	29.0	27.5
D. I do not know what this is.	0	2.6	0

21. How would you evaluate your level of information about the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), also called "Star Wars?"

A. I am well-informed	25.0*	22.2	25.0
B. I am informed	75.0	44.5	67.5*
C. I have heard of it but am not sure what it's all about	0	28.1	7.5
D. I do not know what this is.	0	4.9	0

28. Do you think Canada should allow, or not allow, the U. S. to test the cruise missile over our territory?

A. should allow	2.5	17.1	2.5

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
B. should not allow	95.0*	65.2	82.5*
C. not sure, need more information	0	12.1	12.5
D. no opinion	0	4.9	2.5

29. Do you think Canada should withdraw, or not withdraw, from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)?

A. should withdraw	57.5*	6.8	10.0
B. should not withdraw	5.0	50.0	47.5
C. not sure, need more information	27.5	33.6	27.5*
D. no opinion	10.0	9.1	12.5

31. Do you support, or not support, the U. S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), or "Star Wars" program?

A. support	0	20.9	7.5
B. not support	100.0*	40.3	45.0*
C. not sure, need more information	0	26.9	35.0
D. no opinion	0	11.4	10.0

32. Do you think Canada should be building, or not building, nuclear power reactors?

A. should build	17.5	25.2	25.0
B. should not build	27.5	48.8	40.0*
C. not sure, need more information	40.0*	18.3	22.5
D. no opinion	12.5	6.4	10.0

34. Do you think the Canadian arms industry should be selling, or not selling, weapons to the U. S. armed forces?

A. should sell	0	36.9	22.5
B. should not sell	92.5*	38.8	62.5*

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
C. not sure, need more information	5.0	14.5	7.5
D. no opinion	2.5	8.9	5.0

35. Do you think the Canadian arms industry should be selling, or not selling, weapons to the Third World?

A. should sell	7.5	12.0	20.0
B. should not sell	90.0*	64.2	55.0*
C. not sure, need more information	2.5	15.4	15.0
D. no opinion	0	7.4	5.0

36. Which of the following expresses your ;view about Canada's defense spending?

A. Canada should spend more	0	21.0	2.5
B. Canada should spend less	40.0*	27.9	27.5
C. the present defense spending is adequate	2.5	25.6	60.0*
D. no opinion	57.5	22.5	10.0

51. From which of the following do you get most of your information regarding news about Canada and the world?

A. newspapers	42.5	19.4	5.0
B. radio	7.5	14.4	5.0
C. television	50.0*	51.5	90.0*
D. books and magazines	0	4.7	0
E. other	0	4.1	0

67. Which of the following most closely corresponds to your attitude?

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
A. the arms production industry creates jobs and develops technology that can be used throughout the economy	7.5	24.3	55.0
B. the arms production industry creates fewer jobs than if the capital were invested elsewhere, such as in education or health care.	82.5*	36.4	20.0*
C. no opinion	5.0	28.8	25.0

Attitudes

40. How do you evaluate Canada's policies and actions in promoting peace?

A. very satisfactory	0	7.5	0
B. satisfactory	5.0	37.0	62.5*
C. unsatisfactory	30.0*	29.1	22.5
D. very unsatisfactory	0	5.2	0
E. no opinion	62.5	19.1	12.5

42. Have you ever been in a situation where you resorted to physical violence?

A. yes	22.5	66.7	72.5
B. no	77.5	31.6	20.0

44. "A person's behaviour and beliefs principally depend on the culture in which he/she is brought up."

A. strongly agree	12.5	37.0	25.0
B. agree	55.0*	48.1	55.0*
C. not sure	10.0	6.4	20.0
D. disagree	12.5	5.9	0

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
E. strongly disagree	7.5	1.3	0

45. "The best way to prevent another world war is for our side to build up such strong defense that the other side will be deterred (stopped) from attacking us."

A. strongly agree	2.5	3.9	25.0
B. agree	12.5	7.2	27.5
C. not sure	12.5	15.3	17.5
D. disagree	55.0	30.8	27.5*
E. strongly disagree	17.5*	41.5	0

46. If you were participating in some team sport (for example soccer, basketball, etc.) and a player on the opposing team purposely tripped you three times and the referee, when spoken to, did nothing, how would you respond?

A. trip them back	10.0	28.9	42.5
B. threaten the player with "stop it or else"	22.5	18.6	35.0*
C. try to verbally persuade this player to stop	47.5	21.4	20.0
D. ignore them	17.5*	17.8	0
E. other	2.5	11.6	0

47. "War is learned behaviour, and, as such, can be unlearned."

A. strongly agree	2.5*	13.1	5.0
B. agree	15.0	29.3	5.0*
C. not sure	12.5	31.7	70.0
D. disagree	35.0	19.3	15.0
E. strongly disagree	30.0	4.8	5.0

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
48. "The elimination of all nuclear weapons is the only road to world peace."			
A. strongly agree	67.5*	20.9	12.5
B. agree	17.5	26.4	32.5
C. not sure	2.5	21.5	42.5*
D. disagree	7.5	21.2	12.5
E. strongly disagree	5.0	8.5	0
49. "One of the primary reasons that humanity has been involved in so many wars is that the overwhelming majority of world leaders have been MEN."			
A. strongly agree	2.5	8.9	7.5
B. agree	0	20.9	32.5
C. not sure	30.0	21.7	35.0
D. disagree	50.0	29.5	20.0*
E. strongly disagree	17.5*	17.1	2.5
52. Which of the following most closely reflects your attitudes?			
A. women should be allowed in combat roles in the military	20.0	45.2	7.5
B. women should <u>not</u> be allowed in combat roles in the military	40.0*	17.9	47.5*
C. not sure	25.0	14.6	17.5
D. no opinion	12.5	18.5	22.5
56. Are there any groups of people (cultural, ethnic, sexual, racial, etc.) for whom you feel some contempt or disrespect?			
A. yes	10.0	34.7	42.5*
B. no	67.5*	50.3	22.5
C. not sure	22.5	10.5	35.0

	ACTUAL GDR	ACTUAL JAC	GDR PREDICT JAC STUDENT
61. When your needs or interests conflict with someone else's needs or interests, do you generally:			
A. try to win the conflict	5.0	26.8	52.5*
B. yield to preserve the peace	47.5*	32.3	15.0
C. other	42.5	34.9	30.0
66. If you were offered a $40,000/year job to work in an industry producing weapons for the U. S. military, would you accept?			
A. yes	2.5	29.3	57.5
B. no	85.0*	36.3	2.5
C. not sure	7.5	26.7	40.0

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Halliday, Fred, The Making of the Second Cold War, Chapter 3, "The Decline of US Military Superiority," London, England: Verso Editions, 1986. In this chapter Halliday convincingly demonstrates that if one takes the geopolitical situation of both the USSR and the U. S. and the military strength of all major capitalist and socialist states combined, then overall the socialist countries of the Warsaw Pact are quite considerably militarily inferior in both conventional and nuclear arms to the leading capitalist countries of the world.

[2] Silverman, Alan, "Peace and Violence in the Student Mind: Highlights of a Survey of 1,073 Community College Students," Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec: unpublished manuscript, 1987, pp. 7 and 10.

[3] Silverman, Alan, ibid., p. 9.

[4] The most extreme example I can think of is the following quote from Zeuske, Max, A Short History of the United States of America, Leipzig, German Democratic Republic: VEB Verlag Enzyklopaedie, 1987, p. 100. "The switch of the [American] economy to peace-time production [after World War II] caused enormous problems--and showed itself in the last resort to be impossible since the military-industrial complex found a "way out" in the export of arms and in continually stoking up the armaments policy. This led to high unemployment (1944, 670,000; 1946, 2.3 million unemployed) and to restrictions on production." If I understand this quote correctly, it is not the switch to peace-time production after World War II which brought on high unemployment, but intensified arms production which had this effect.

[5] In the Opposing Viewpoint Series in the text entitled The American Military, St. Paul, Minnesota: Greenhaven Press, 1983, the best the editors can come up with in response to Lloyd Dumas, "Military Spending is Destroying the Economy" is Caspar Weinberger, "U. S. Must Respond to Soviet Spending." In this essay Weinberger spends only one paragraph saying that the effects of military spending are not so bad on the American economy, and the rest of the article describing the necessity of military spending to thwart the "Russian threat."

[6] Department of National Defense, Peace and Security, Ottawa, n. d., pp. 2 - 3, as quoted in Silverman, Alan, ibid., p. 13.

[7] Hesse, Petra, "Stereotypes Mask Feelings of Fear." Media and Values, #39. May, 1987, p. 5.

[8] As quoted in Mack, J. E., "But What About the Russians? Some Psychological Dimensions of the Nuclear Arms Race. Harvard Magazine. March/April, 1982, pp. 24 and 53.

[9] As quoted in Mack, John E., "Some Thoughts on the Nuclear Age and the Psychological Roots of anti-Sovietism." (Presented at the Special Session on Psycho-analysis and the Prevention of Nuclear War, University of Hamburg, FRG, 1985, p. 276.

[10] As quoted in Mack, John E., ibid., pp. 276 - 277.

[11] As quoted in Mack, John E., "But What About the Russians," p. 53.

[12] As quoted in Mack, John E., ibid., p. 23.

[13] As quoted in Farren, Pat, ed., What Will It Take to Prevent Nuclear War?, Cambridge: Schenkman, 1983, p. 119.

[14] As quoted in Mack, John E., "Some Thoughts on the Nuclear Age and the Psychological Roots of anti-Sovietism," p. 270.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991